UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT DISTRICT OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN RE PHARMACEUTICAL INDUSTRY AVERAGE WHOLESALE PRICE LITIGATION) MDL NO. 1456) Civil Action No. 01-12257-PBS) Subcategory Case No. 06-11337-PBS)
THIS DOCUMENT RELATES TO: United States ex rel. Ven-A-Care of the Florida Keys, Inc. v. Schering Corporation, Schering-Plough Corporation and Warrick Pharmaceuticals Corporation, Civil Action No. 09-CV-10547, and United States ex rel. Ven-A-Care of the Florida Keys, Inc. v. Schering Corporation, Schering-Plough Corporation and Warrick Pharmaceuticals Corporation, Civil Action No. 00-CV-10698) Judge Patti J. Saris)))))))))))))))))))

THE CITY OF NEW YORK AND NEW YORK COUNTIES' CONSENTED-TO MOTION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME TO RESPOND TO MOTION FOR APPROVAL OF SETTLEMENT

Plaintiffs, the City of New York and New York Counties, respectfully move with consent from Schering-Plough, Schering, Ven-A-Care of the Florida Keys, and the States of California and Florida (the "Proposed Settlement Parties") for a one week extension to file their response to the Joint Motion for Approval of the Settlement between California, Florida, and Relator Ven-A-Care of the Florida Keys on Behalf of Itself and the United States and Schering-Plough, Schering and Warrick [Docket No. 6359; Sub-docket No. 351]. In support of this motion, plaintiffs state the following:

1. On August 7, 2009, the Proposed Settlement Parties filed their joint motion for approval

of their proposed settlement. [Docket No. 6359; Sub-docket No. 351].

- 2. Without an extension, plaintiffs' response to the proposed settlement would be due August 21, 2009.
- 3. On August 18, 2009, with the consent of the Proposed Settlement Parties, the United States filed a request for an extension of one week to respond to the joint motion for approval of the proposed settlement [Docket No. 6359, Sub-docket No. 351]. *See* Docket No. 6380; Sub-docket No. 366.
- 4. At the July 24, 2009 status conference, the court granted the State of Massachusetts an August 28, 2009 deadline to file their response to the proposed settlement. *See* July 24, 2009 Status Conference transcript at 22:2-20.
- 5. An extension to file a response by August 28, 2009, would allow plaintiffs to be in the same posture as the United States and Massachusetts in responding to the proposed settlement.
- 6. Furthermore, the joint motion for approval of the proposed settlement presents complex legal and factual issues in an accompanying 29-page memorandum and supporting affidavits [Docket Nos. 6359-6363; Sub-docket Nos. 354-357] to which plaintiffs intend to respond.
- 7. Each of the Proposed Settlement Parties has consented to plaintiffs' request for an extension to respond to the joint motion for approval of the proposed settlement.

For the foregoing reasons, plaintiffs respectfully request that this motion be granted. A proposed order is attached hereto.

Dated: August 19, 2009

Respectfully submitted,

City of New York and New York Counties in MDL 1456 except Nassau and Orange by

KIRBY McINERNEY, LLP

825 Third Avenue New York, New York 10022 (212) 371-6600

/s/ Joanne M. Cicala_

By: Joanne M. Cicala, Esq.
James P. Carroll Jr., Esq.
Jocelyn R. Normand, Esq.
Kathryn B. Allen, Esq.

Ross B. Brooks, Esq.
MILBERG LLP
One Pennsylvania Plaza
New York, NY 10119
(212) 594-5300
Special Counsel for the County of Nassau

Theresa A. Vitello, Esq.
LEVY PHILLIPS &
KONIGSBERG, LLP
800 Third Avenue
New York, NY 10022
(212) 605-6205
Counsel for the County of Orange

Case 1:01-cv-12257-PBS Document 6385 Filed 08/19/09 Page 4 of 5

Certification Pursuant to Local Rule 7.1

The undersigned counsel certifies pursuant to Local Rule 7.1(a)(2) that she conferred

with counsel for the Proposed Settlement Parties and that those parties consent to this motion.

Dated: August 19, 2009

/s/ Kathryn B. Allen

Kathryn B. Allen

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I, Kathryn B. Allen, hereby certify that I caused a true and correct copy of the foregoing

City of New York and New York Counties' Consented-To Motion for Extension of Time to

Respond to Motion for Approval of Settlement to be served on counsel of record via electronic

service pursuant to Paragraph 11 of Case Management Order No. 2, by sending a copy to

LexisNexis File & Serve for posting and notification to all parties.

Dated: August 19, 2009

/s/ Kathryn B. Allen

Kathryn B. Allen

4

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT DISTRICT OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN RE PHARMACEUTICAL INDUSTRY AVERAGE WHOLESALE PRICE LITIGATION	 MDL NO. 1456 Civil Action No. 01-12257-PBS Subcategory Case No. 06-11337-PBS 	
THIS DOCUMENT RELATES TO:) Judge Patti J. Saris	
United States ex rel. Ven-A-Care of the Florida Keys, Inc. v. Schering Corporation, Schering-Plough Corporation and Warrick Pharmaceuticals Corporation, Civil Action No. 09-CV-10547, and		
United States ex rel. Ven-A-Care of the Florida Keys, Inc. v. Schering Corporation, Schering-Plough Corporation and Warrick Pharmaceuticals Corporation, Civil Action No. 00-CV-10698)))))	

[PROPOSED] ORDER

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED THAT the City of New York and New York Counties shall be granted a one-week extension to file a response to the Joint Motion for Approval of the Settlement Between California, Florida, and Relator Ven-A-Care of the Florida Keys on Behalf of Itself and the United States and Schering-Plough, Schering and Warrick.

Dated: August ____, 2009

Hon. Patti B. Saris

Hon. Patti B. Saris
United States District Court Judge